

THE INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ZOOLOGICAL
NOMENCLATURE:
RESULT OF VOTE ON PROPOSALS FOR SUBSTANTIVE
AMENDMENTS (THIRD INSTALMENT) Z.N.(G.)182

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature

This report presents the results of a further vote on some of the proposals for substantive changes in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature put forward by the Editorial Committee. They were not published one year before the vote was taken, but were identified in discussion by the Special Session of the Commission at Stenoffa or at the General Meeting at Helsinki. All were considered to arise so naturally out of proposals already published, or to affect such minor points of drafting, that it was not thought necessary to put them through the full Declarations procedure. All were published in the report of the Stenoffa and Helsinki meetings (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 211-221). The present vote was taken so that the Commission will be able to assure the Division of Zoology of IUBS that the instructions received from the Section on Zoological Nomenclature at Helsinki (on the procedures to be followed for completing work on the third edition of the Code) have been followed to the letter.

2. The vote concerns paragraphs 21, 11, 9, 10, 12, 25 and 29 of the report referred to above. Of these, paragraphs 9, 10, 21, 25 and 29 fall into the category just mentioned. Paragraph 11 presents a point that arises naturally out of point 5 on V.P.(79)1. By that vote the Commission decided that generic and specific names published after 1930 with a single combined description of the genus and species should be available; that provision has now been extended to cover family-group and generic names published with a single combined description.

3. The Committee decided to divide paragraph 12 of its report into two parts and to call for a vote at this point only on the first three and a half lines (up to the semicolon after the word 'parts'; see *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, p. 214). The remainder of this paragraph is still under discussion.

4. The Commission was accordingly called upon to vote on the above paragraphs in V.P.(80)15 issued on 9 April 1980. The paragraphs were presented as follows:

V.P.(80)15

Vote No.	Article in Code	Commission Report to Section on Zoological Nomenclature, Helsinki, 1979, Section B
1	11f(i) 42c	21. A generic name that has come to be used as the name of a collective group may continue in that use notwithstanding that the taxon has a type species. The Code Article 11f(i) provides that names for collective groups are treated as generic names, and that collective groups require no type-species (Art. 42c). However, names that have become used for collective groups may be already available names for genera with type species fixed. It is undesirable to require such names to be placed in synonymy with names validly used for other genus-group taxa and removed from the collective groups to which they are applied. While such a name is in use for a collective group, it would be treated as though it has no type.
2	13a	11. That a new generic and a new family name proposed together as new after 1930 with a single description serving for both are not made unavailable solely on the grounds that there are not separate descriptions that are presumed to differentiate or distinguish the taxa. If they satisfy the other provisions of the Code governing availability such names would both be available. Under Article 13a a name proposed after 1930 must, unless a replacement name, be accompanied by a statement that purports to give characters differentiating the taxon or by a bibliographic reference to such a statement. The Commission in VP(79)1 (<i>Bull. zool. Nom.</i> vol. 36: 66-70) has voted to make generic and specific names characterised in a single combined description available after 1930 as well as before 1931 (unless they are not available for some other reason). The Committee recommends that the action relating to genus-group and species-group names be completed by accepting the same principle for family-group and genus-group names.
3	16a(i)	9. To require when an indication for a name proposed before 1931 consists of a bibliographic reference to a previously published description, definition or illustration, that the name so indicated must be treated as valid in the work in which both the name and the bibliographic reference occur. Under Article 12 and Article 16 a(i) an author prior to 1931 can

Vote No.	Article in Code	Commission Report to Section on Zoological Nomenclature, Helsinki, 1979, Section B
----------	-----------------	--

make a previously unavailable name, or a newly proposed name, available by publishing with it as an indication a bibliographic reference to a previously published description. Such names would only become available by that action if, in the work in which the name and the reference are published together, the author has employed the name as a valid name. The provision is implicit in Article 1, but that fact can be overlooked.

4	17	10. To provide that the status of an unavailable name is not changed by mere citation (in synonymy or otherwise) of the name and a bibliographic reference to the work in which it was published in a manner that did not satisfy the criteria of availability. The Committee <i>recommends</i> that this matter be made explicit.
---	----	--

5	26	12. That an available compound epithet published as separate words based on the name of a place or a saint, one being an abbreviation, shall be amended by writing the abbreviation in full and uniting the parts.
---	----	--

6	67	25. That a designation of a type species made in contravention of the provision that the name of a type species is the binomen (or trinomen) in its correct original spelling and original combination would be valid but the name of the type species should be correctly cited by subsequent authors. In VP(79)1 (<i>Bull. zool. Nom.</i> vol. 36: 66-70) the Commission adopted a recommendation that the name of a type species is the binomen or trinomen in its correct original spelling and original combination (see A14 above). This addition completes the provision.
---	----	---

7	75	29. To specify that the designation of a specimen to be a neotype other than in accordance with and under the conditions specified in the Code in the 'cases admitted' (2nd Edn Art. 75a) is not a valid designation and the specimen so designated not a neotype. The Code Article 75c lists qualifying conditions and specifies that a neotype is validly designated only when published with certain specified particulars. In addition (Art. 75a) the Code states that a neotype 'is to be designated only in connection with revisory work, and then only in exceptional
---	----	---

circumstances' that are specified, but it is not explicit that a neotype designated under circumstances other than those described in Article 75a has no status in nomenclature. The proposal provides that neotypes designated in circumstances other than those admitted in the Code are invalid.

At the close of the voting period on 9 July 1980, votes had been received in the following order: Sabrosky, Melville, Heppell, Holthuis, Nye, Mroczkowski, Vokes, Dupuis, Corliss, Brinck, Trjapitzin, Willink, Ride, Bayer, Kraus, Hahn, Starobogatov, Halvorsen, Alvarado, Binder, Tortonese, Welch, Bernardi. The state of the voting was as follows:

	For	Against
(1) Article 11f(i), Availability	19	2
(2) Article 13a, Availability	22	0
(3) Article 16a(i), Indications	20	1
(4) Article 17, Non-availability	20	2
(5) Article 26, Formation of names	21	1
(6) Article 67, Type species	22	0
(7) Article 75, Neotypes	22	0

Dupuis abstained on all points and Trjapitzin on Points (1) and (3). No voting papers were returned by Habe and Cogger.

The following comments were sent in by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Vote 1

Holthuis: 'A nominal genus can never lose its type species, not even when any zoologist uses its name for what he calls a "collective group".'

Trjapitzin: 'In this case I refrain from voting because the addition makes the text of the article longer but does not change its sense.'

Ride: 'In voting in the affirmative, I must make it clear that the vote is confined to the content of the first sentence. While there is no objection to such names being cited as junior synonyms of valid generic names, there should be no consequential requirement for such junior synonyms to be removed from the collective groups they are used to represent.'

Starobogatov: 'Names generally used for collective groups must be adopted as such by special ruling of the Commission. Any other formulation leads to confusion.'

Vote 3

Heppell: 'I am against this proposal not only because most such names not treated as valid would be synonyms which should remain capable of being validated under Article 11d, but because it needlessly introduces an element of doubt. There are many cases of names about which it is impossible to be sure whether the author making reference to them treated them as valid or not. The most obvious examples are nomenclators and catalogues of collections, but there are other cases where authors included previously unavailable names of nominal species qualified by expressions of doubt as to their taxonomic status. It would be difficult to draw the line between conditional acceptance and provisional synonymy. When, however, an author refers to a previously unavailable name explicitly for historical purposes only I would be against accepting such a reference as an indication conferring availability upon the name. I would prefer the few doubtful cases to be brought to the Commission for a decision to this stringent proposal, the effects of which on stability are impossible to foresee. Practically all cases of availability through bibliographic reference involve specific rather than generic names, as, if a species *A-us b-us* were published with a bibliographic reference to its otherwise unavailable synonym *X-us y-us*, *X-us* would in any case be available through its direct association with *b-us* (Draft Code Article 67m).'

Vote 4

Heppell: 'According to my notes made at the time this provision was rejected by the Stenoffa Special Session as being inconsistent with the rule on names first published in synonymy (Article 11d). A name first published as a junior synonym in association with a bibliographic reference to an illustration may later have been removed from synonymy and used as a valid name, if the species illustrated proved to be distinct from that denoted by the senior synonym. Such names would all be at risk as a result of the proposed restriction, especially in view of the additional provision in a later draft of the present Code that "a name that is unavailable under any of the other provisions of this Chapter cannot be made available by adoption from a citation as a junior synonym". At present the status of an unavailable name was obviously changed by "mere citation" in synonymy, as it became potentially available for adoption as a valid name up till the end of 1960.'

Vote 5

Alvarado: 'This question is not clear to me.'

Vote 7

Trjapitzin: 'I fully agree, but it is necessary to add to Article 75c that "exceptional circumstances" must be clarified by a zoologist who designates a neotype.'

DECLARATION OF RESULT OF VOTE

The result of the vote on V.P.(80)15 is that all the points submitted for a vote received the two-thirds majority required under Article 16a(iv) of the Constitution. The publication of this report announces the intention of the Commission to incorporate the proposed amendments into the Code, in accordance with the authority given to it by the Division of Zoology of IUBS at Helsinki, and in words to be prepared by the Editorial Committee for the Commission's approval.

R.V. MELVILLE

Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

6 October 1980